UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/104,297	06/24/98	HUMPLEMAN R	2810-044

LM02/0808

KENNETH L. SHERMAN, ESQ.
SHERMAN & SHERMAN
2029 CENTRY PARK EAST
SEVENTEENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90067

EXAMINER	
BASHORE, W	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2776	15

DATE MAILED: 08/08/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/104,297	Applicant(s) Humpleman et al.
	Examiner William L. Bashore	Group Art Unit 2776

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *May 22, 2000*

☒ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire *3* month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 5/22/2000 to the original application filed on 6/24/1998, with acknowledged provisional application filing dates of 9/22/1997, and 6/25/1997.

2. The rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corcoran has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

3. The rejection of claims 5, 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corcoran and Reber has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

4. Claims 6, 8 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corcoran and Venkatraman.

5. Claims 1-8 are pending in this case. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Drawings

6. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1-4, 6, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corcoran, P.M. and Desbonnet, J., Browser-style interfaces to a home automation network (hereinafter Corcoran), Consumer Electronics - IEEE, June 11-13, 1997, pp.1063-1069, in view of Venkatraman et al (hereinafter Venkatraman), U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487 issued September 1999.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Corcoran teaches a browser displaying a list of network devices registered in a local database (see Corcoran p.1065 section 3.3, Figure 3; compare with amended claim 1 "*generating a device link file, wherein the device link file identifies home devices that are currently connected to the home network*").

Corcoran also teaches a Network Browser displaying four graphical buttons representing four devices from said list (see Corcoran p.1065 Figure 3; compare with amended claim 1 "*creating a device link page*" and "*wherein the device link page contains a device button that is associated with each home device that is identified in the device link file*").

Corcoran does not specifically teach a list of network devices contained within a local network. However, Venkatraman teaches a self contained home network comprising inter-communication links and a web browser enabling communication with a set of devices (see Venkatraman column 5 lines 29-40, 46-51, Figure 2; compare with amended claim 1 "*...from at least the local network...*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Venkatraman to Corcoran, because of the advantages of a self-contained home network that Venkatraman provides.

Corcoran also teaches a method whereby a Network Browser displayed onto a screen displays four graphical buttons representing four devices from said list, and as each device is accessed, a user interface is loaded as a HiPlet from an HTTP-style URL (see Corcoran p.1065 section 3.3; compare with amended

claim 1 "*associating a hyper-text link with each device button....that is associated with the device button*"). Corcoran does not specifically teach a method of using a hypertext link (from said button), providing a link to an HTML page. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a the time of the invention to modify Corcoran to incorporate this limitation, because Corcoran suggests the use of HTML by disclosing the use of HTTP, URL's, and the name "Network Browser", which are examples of objects and methods that are commonly used in conjunction with HTML and hypertext linking, therefore providing increased adaptability to the method as taught by Corcoran.

In addition, Corcoran teaches the display of device information on a network browser (see Corcoran p.1065 Figure 3; compare with amended claim 1 "*displaying the device link page on a browser based home device.*").

In regard to dependent claim 2, Corcoran teaches a method whereby light-switch GUI is displayed, said GUI indicating that said light-switch is active (see Corcoran p.1067 section 5.1; compare with claim 2 "*detecting that a home device is connected to the home network*").

In addition, Corcoran teaches an internal system architecture, whereby a home- interactive programlet (HiPlet) uses CEBus to route messages between various system devices (see Corcoran p.1065 section 3.2, Figure 2; compare with claim 2 "*associating a logical device name with the home device*").

In addition, Corcoran teaches the use of a CALNetd daemon to record the state of network devices in a local registry of devices (see Corcoran p.1065 section 3.2 paragraph 3; compare with claim 2 "*storing the logical device name in the device link file*").

In regard to dependent claim 3, Corcoran teaches the display of a list of network devices that are registered in a local database, said devices are shown and mapped to corresponding device buttons (see Corcoran p.1065 section 3.3, Figure 3; compare with claim 3).

In regard to dependent claim 4, Corcoran teaches the implementation of a light-switch GUI, whereby an icon (graphical image) of an LED representing the state of activation of a light bulb is created as part of a button, and is stored as part of the GUI interface (see Corcoran p.1067 Figure 5a; compare with claim 4).

In regard to dependent claim 6, Corcoran teaches a method whereby a Network Browser displayed onto a screen displays four graphical buttons representing four devices from a list of home devices, and as each device is accessed, a user interface is loaded as a HiPlet from an HTTP-style URL (see Corcoran p.1065 section 3.3, Figure 3). Corcoran does not specifically teach a method of receiving a URL from a home device. However, Venkatraman teaches a method whereby a home based network enables a web browser to access user interface functions via URL's, said URL's can be embedded within an appliance (see Venkatraman column 5 lines 29-42, column 8 lines 1-8; compare with claim 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the separate URL method of Venkatraman to the list and button GUI of Corcoran, because of Venkatraman's taught advantage of itemized information gathering, providing increased information selectivity to the method as taught by Corcoran.

In regard to dependent claim 8, Corcoran teaches a method whereby a Network Browser displayed onto a screen displays four graphical buttons representing four devices from a list of home devices, and as each device is accessed, a user interface is loaded as a HiPlet from an HTTP-style URL (see Corcoran p.1065 section 3.3, Figure 3). Corcoran does not specifically teach a method of receiving a URL from a properties file located on a home device. However, Venkatraman teaches a method whereby web server queries a device, and in response, the targeted device transfers an HTML file that defines its device web page (see Venkatraman column 7 lines 37-46; compare with claim 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the remote file method of Venkatraman to the list and button GUI of Corcoran, because of Venkatraman's taught advantage of itemized information gathering, providing increased space efficiency to the method as taught by Corcoran.

9. **Claims 5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corcoran and Venkatraman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Reber et al. (hereinafter Reber), U.S. Patent No. 5,398,726 issued August 1999.**

In regard to dependent claim 5, Corcoran teaches a method whereby a Network Browser displayed onto a screen displays four graphical buttons representing four devices from a list of home devices, and as each device is accessed, a user interface is loaded as a HiPlet from an HTTP-style URL (see Corcoran p.1065 section 3.3, Figure 3). Corcoran does not specifically teach a method of receiving a device logo from a home device. However, Reber teaches a method of displaying a graphical logo relating to a device onto a browser screen (see Reber Figure 3; compare with claim 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the logo method of Reber to the list

and button GUI of Corcoran, because of Reber's taught advantage of graphical logos, providing increased device recognizability to the method as taught by Corcoran.

In regard to dependent claim 7, Corcoran teaches the importance of manufacturers flexibility to change and adapt the user interface (see Corcoran p.1063 section 2.2 paragraph 2; compare with claim 7.

10. **Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.**

Petler	U.S. Patent No. 6,081,519	issued	June 2000
Humpleman	U.S. Patent No. 6,005,861	issued	December 1999

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 5/22/2000 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on p.4 (also repeated on p.6 bottom, also p.7 regarding claim 5, p.9 regarding claim 6, p.11 regarding claim 8) of the Amendment that Corcoran's user interface for a device does not originate from the local system software and instead it is loaded as a HiPlet from an HTTP-style URL, retrieved outside of the local network. The Examiner has added Venkatraman to Corcoran for the rejection of claim 1 to teach this limitation. Venkatraman teaches a local home network without a connection to any external network (ie. the Internet). The web browser interacts with other devices by receiving device specific user interface web pages from the devices (see Venkatraman column 5 lines 47-51).

Applicant also argues on p.5 of the Amendment that there is no motivation for Corcoran to provide a separate hyper-text link to allow a user to access an HTML page of the device as the user desires. The

Examiner notes that Corcoran does teach the loading of user interfaces for any consumer appliance with a CEBus power line interface and an embedded URL (see Corcoran p.1065 column 2 section 3.4. In addition Venkatraman teaches a self-contained home network whereby a browser can select an interface web page from a device (see Venkatraman column 5 lines 48-51, column 8 lines 1-8).

Applicant also argues on p.5 of the Amendment that Corcoran mandates that the HTML page of the device be accessed in order to make the user-interface for that device functional on the network and would not need to provide a user the option of accessing the HTML page of the device as desired. The Examiner respectfully notes that Corcoran teaches a network browser device interface page containing four buttons. The program monitors the local home network traffic and provides hardware level responses, as well as interact with virtual representations of devices to be voluntary accessed by a user via said buttons (see Corcoran p.1066 column 1 paragraph 3).

Applicant argues on p.8 of the Amendment that, because of the diverse functioning Corcoran and Reber, there would be no motivation for the combination thereof to provide a LOGO as claimed by Applicants. The Examiner respectfully notes that Corcoran teaches a network browser device interface page containing four buttons representing different devices. Although Corcoran does not specifically teach the limitation of graphical logos, Reber teaches a web page with different buttons and icons on the bottom of said page, said page also incorporates a logo of a company (Motorola) (see Reber Figure 3, also column 4 lines 19-27). Since graphical logos are well known in the art for advertising and product differentiation purposes, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate graphical product logos to the user interface of Corcoran, in order to fascillitate user selection of various product devices.

Applicant further argues on p.9 of the Amendment that Corcoran does not show storing a manufacturer device button in a user definable area of a device link page. The Examiner respectfully notes

that this limitation merely reflects a design choice, said design choice is suggested by Corcoran's teaching of the importance of manufacturers flexibility to change and adapt the user interface.

Applicant argues on p.10 of the Amendment that Venkatraman teaches away from Applicant's claimed invention (also repeated on p.11 bottom), and that Corcoran does not teach receiving a URL from a home device (also repeated on p.10). The Examiner respectfully notes that claim 6 deals with the retrieval of a URL from a home device (maintained in a properties file of said home device), and the association of said URL with a button associated with a home device. Corcoran teaches a network browser comprising four device related buttons. URLs are associated with said buttons to load a HiPlet (see Corcoran p.1065 section 3.3). Venkatraman teaches a self-contained home network whereby devices can supply device specific user interface web pages (URL) to a web browser, as is taught in the rejection of claim 1.

Applicant argues on p.11 of the Amendment that there would be no motivation for providing a separate URL because Corcoran mandates that device information be directly downloaded from the home page of the device. The Examiner respectfully notes that Venkatraman teaches device specific URL's presented to a browser.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is **(703) 308-5807**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached on **(703) 305-4713**. The fax number to this art unit is **(703) 308-6606**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900**.

14. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 305-9724 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

William L. Bashore
7/31/2000

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER